

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-24 and rejected same. With this paper, the claims are unchanged. Reconsideration is requested.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

At section 2 of the Office action, claims 1-9, 13-18 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kukkohovi (US 6,119,003).

The invention is provided to make it easier for a person using a first communication device to reach another person using a second communication device where the two devices are each capable of communicating by more than one bearer/ communication technology. With the invention, the first communication device obtains association information indicating the different possible bearers that can be used to reach the second communication device. All of the independent claims (i.e. claims 1, 13, 15 and 20) recite that the association information providing alternative bearers by which the second device can be reached is obtained from a contacts bearer data store in which bearers are arranged by contact.

Applicant has argued that Kukkohovi does not teach obtaining association information as in claim 1. Kukkohovi addresses the problem of how to transparently transfer from one network to another always trying to arrange for a connection via a favored network (even during a call). Such a transfer can be before or during a conversation. Kukkohovi discloses that the networks (different bearers) can be arranged in an ordered or prioritized list that is stored in the terminal. However, Kukkohovi nowhere discloses or suggests obtaining association information from a contacts data store where different possible bearers are provided arranged by contact, i.e. for each contact a list of possible bearers is provided. Thus, Kukkohovi does not provide the functionality of the invention as in the independent claims, since

the association information per the independent claims is on a per contact/ user basis, and not the same for all contacts/ users.

In response, the Office has disagreed, asserting that Kukkohovi discloses that the user can order/ prioritize the list of networks stored in the terminal. Applicant respectfully submits that even though the user can order/ prioritize the list of networks, there is no teaching or suggestion in Kukkohovi of a user providing one list for one contact, and another list for another contact. (A contact is not the user of the first device, but is instead a person the user of the first device might want to contact.) The list is the same for all contacts, i.e. it is not provided on a per contact basis, even though it may be input by the user of the device.

In contrast to what is disclosed in Kukkhovi, the invention as in claim 1 includes as a limitation that "the contacts bearer data store (11d 11d') associates contacts with bearers so as to arrange the association information by contact," i.e. the contacts bearer data store includes information associating each contact with bearers to be used for that contact (where, as above, a "contact" is person that the user of the device might want to contact). The limitation does not say that the user arranges the bearers, which the Examiner seemed to indicate in the telephone interview is his understanding of the claim language. Instead, the limitation says that the contacts bearer data store in effect arranges the bearers by contact, since the contacts bearer data store "associates contacts with bearers so as to arrange the association information by contact." For example, the data store could include a table of bearer records indicating all information for each bearer as separate fields, and including a unique key field value for each bearer, and then for each contact stored as a record in the data store, there could be a list of key fields pointed to by a field in the contact record. The pointer to the

list of key fields for the contact would be, in this example, the "association information" recited in the claim.

Thus, according to the claim 1 with the added limitation, for each contact the data store holds or indicates (via association information) a list of bearers, and the list for one contact can be different from the list for another contact. This is not possible according to the teachings of Kukkohovi.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §102 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 10-12, 19 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Kukkohovi in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0243684.

On at least the ground that all the claims rejected under 35 USC §103 depend from one or another of the independent claims all believed allowable as set out above, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §103 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's attorney urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

Respectfully submitted,

23 Feb. 2006

Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468-0224



James A. Retter  
Registration No. 41,266

tel: (203) 261-1234  
Cust. No.: 004955